

## CI-FSS-152 ADDITIONAL EVALUATION FACTORS (MAR 2009)

- (a) The government will consider award for an offeror who has been determined to be responsible, whose offer conforms to all solicitation requirements, is determined technically acceptable, has acceptable past performance and whose prices are determined fair and reasonable.
- (b) All technical evaluation factors will be reviewed, evaluated and rated acceptable or unacceptable based on the criteria listed below. Award will be made on a per Special Item Number (SIN) basis. A rating of “unacceptable” under any technical evaluation factor, by SIN, will result in an “unacceptable” rating overall for that SIN, in which that SIN will be rejected. Offers determined unacceptable for all proposed SIN(s) will be rejected.
- (c) Each offeror must have a satisfactory performance record. A prospective contractor shall not be determined responsible or nonresponsible solely on the basis of a lack of relevant performance history, except as provided in 9.104-2;

### TECHNCAL EVALUATION FACTORS:

#### (1) FACTOR 1. Financial Responsibility Determination

- (i) Provide the most current, completed, audited (if available) 2 years of consolidated financial statements, specifically balance sheets and income statements, or information that demonstrates the company’s financial capacity. The contracting officer will use balance sheet and income statement financial information to determine financial capability. Note that providing tax returns is not required.
- (ii) Provide a summary explanation for any negative financial information shown, including negative equity or income.

#### (2) FACTOR 2. Corporate Experience

- (i) Submit a two-page (maximum) narrative describing the company’s corporate experience for all proposed (SINs), regardless of the number of SINs being offered. For each SIN offered, your company shall provide the type of supplies and/or professional services procured by either a Government or Commercial entity for a **minimum of two years**. At a minimum, the narrative shall include the following:
  - (A) Organization’s number of years of corporate experience relevant to this offer.
  - (B) Organization’s structure, to include size, experience in the field, and resources available to enable the offeror to fulfill requirements.
  - (C) Brief history of the organization’s activities contributing to the development of relevant expertise and capabilities.
  - (D) Information that demonstrates organizational and accounting controls and manpower presently in-house or the ability to acquire the type and kinds of manpower proposed.
  - (E) Describe/identify how the contract will be marketed to ordering activities.
  - (F) For Dealers (i.e., non-manufacturers) Only # For supply offers, submit complete Letter(s) of Supply from Manufacturers or other evidence of sustainable sources of supply.
  - (G) For Authentication Products and Services (Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12 (HSPD-12) Only: All offers must be in compliance with guidance in National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Special Publication (SP) 800-63, OMB Memorandum 04-04:

- (1) SIN 132-60a: Offerings must include policy-compliant agency setup,

testing, credential issuance, subscriber customer service account management, revocation, and credential validation as part of the basic service.

Technical evaluation criteria are:

- (i) Successful completion of Level 1 Credential Assessment --  
Include Assessment Report
- (ii) Successful completion of applicable interoperability testing --  
Include Test Report

(2) SIN 132.60b: Offerings must include policy-compliant agency setup, testing, identity proofing, credential issuance, subscriber customer service account management, revocation, and credential validation as part of the basic service.

Technical evaluation criteria are:

- (i) Successful completion of Level 2 Credential Assessment --  
Include Assessment report
- (ii) Successful completion of applicable interoperability testing --  
Include Test Report

(3) SIN 132-60c: Offerings must include policy compliant ID proofing, Credential issuance, continued account management, revocation, and certificate validation as part of the basic service.

Technical evaluation criteria are:

- (i) Successful completion of Level 3 and 4 Credential Assessment --  
Include Assessment report
- (ii) Access Certificates for Electronic Services (ACES) Security Certification and Accreditation (C&A) as a condition of obtaining and retaining approval to operate as a Certification Authority (CA) under the ACES Certificate policy and the GSA ACES Program. --  
Include Authorization to Operate (ATO) letter.
- (iii) Common criteria for other Certification Authorities cross certified by the Federal Bridge

(4) SIN 132-60d: Offerings must be:

- (i) Listed on GSA's Federal Information Processing Standards (FIPS) 201 Approved Products List.
- (ii) Crypto Modules must be FIPS 140-2 validated.

(5) SIN 132-60e: Offerings must include precursor services such as bulk load, testing, identity proofing, credential issuance, subscriber customer service account management, revocation, and credential validation as part of the basic service. Also includes translation and validation services, and partial services such as 3<sup>rd</sup>-party identity proofing or secure hosting.

Technical evaluation criteria are:

- (i) Demonstrated compliance with NIST SP 800-63, as applicable to the technologies being utilized by the offeror.
- (ii) Compliance with published E-Authentication architecture, verified by a clearance letter from GSA's Office of Governmentwide Policy.

(6) SIN 132-60f: Technical evaluation criteria are:

- (i) Documented experience with deployment of policy-compliant Identity and Access Management (IAM) projects in government agencies. This includes IAM technologies and standards, including Security Assertion Markup Language (SAML), Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) and the Web Services (WS)-Federation

specification. Offerors should describe in detail their competencies when proposing under this SIN.

(3) FACTOR 3. Past Performance:

(i) The offeror shall order and submit a Past Performance Evaluation from Open Ratings, Inc. (ORI). Offerors are responsible for payment to ORI for the Past Performance Evaluation.

(A) Past Performance Evaluations are valid for a period of one year from date of issuance by ORI. The submission of an evaluation issued more than one year prior to the date of proposal submission will result in rejection of the proposal.

(B) Offeror is advised to use references from projects involving relevant IT supplies and IT services within the scope of this solicitation. All pertinent North American Industry Classification System Code (NAICS) are in the solicitation. If these references were not provided to ORI, please explain why.

(c) The offeror shall address any negative feedback contained in the ORI report. Explain what actions have been taken to minimize the problems that resulted in negative feedback.

(4) FACTOR 4. Project Experience for SIN 132-51 and SIN 132-60f only (IT and Identity Access Management (IAM) Professional Services)

(i) Provide a description of the offeror's experience in the professional information technology services offered under SIN 132-51 and SIN 132-60f. Describe **three** completed or on-going project(s), similar in size and complexity to the effort contemplated herein and in sufficient detail for the Government to perform an evaluation. **For SIN 132-60f, two of the three projects described must be prior federal government application deployment projects for public-facing IT systems.** Each completed example shall have been completed **within the last two years**. All examples of completed services shall have been found to be acceptable by the ordering activity. If the Offeror cannot provide three examples of past experience, they may provide additional documentation to substantiate project experience to be evaluated by the Contracting Officer.

(ii) Within the two page limitation for each project narrative, offerors shall outline the following for proposed SIN 132-51 and 132-60f:

(A) Provide background information on the project or projects presented to demonstrate expertise.

(B) Outline how the project or projects are related to the proposed SIN(s).

(C) Submit summary of the final deliverables for the noted project or projects.

(D) Offerors shall demonstrate that the tasks performed are of a similar complexity to the work solicited under this solicitation.

(E) Provide the following information for each project submitted:

(1) Project/Contract Name;

(2) Project Description;

(3) Dollar Amount of Contract;

(4) Project Duration, which includes the original estimated completion date and the actual completion date; and

(5) Point of Contact and Telephone Number

PRICE PROPOSAL FACTOR:

(5) FACTOR 5. Price Proposal:

(i) In accordance with GSAM 538.270, Evaluation of multiple awards schedule (MAS) offers, the goal of the Government is to obtain the offeror's best price given to the offeror's Most Favored Customer (MFC). Therefore, GSA is required to obtain pricing that is equal to or better than the Most Favored Customer pricing with the same or similar terms and conditions. This objective will be met by evaluation of price and price discounts, terms, conditions, and concessions offered to the Most Favored Commercial Customers. If the MFC is a Federal Agency, but sales exist to commercial clients, identify which, if any, of the commercial clients obtain the best price. This will allow the Government to establish a "basis of award" customer in accordance with the Price Reductions Clause 552.238-75, paragraph (a).

(ii) Price Proposal will be evaluated for its successful completion of all requirements outlined in the General Proposal Submission Instructions in the Cover Page of the solicitation document. The Contracting Officer must determine that the proposed pricing is fair, reasonable, and supportable, based on the submission of sufficient pricing information as outlined in the Proposal Submission Special Instructions.

(iii) The proposed pricing must be advantageous to the Government, and inclusive of the Industrial Funding Fee (IFF). If the rates offered are not "equal to or lower than" the Most Favored Customer (MFC), an acceptable justification must be provided.